



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,013	02/25/2004	Kirsten Lauridsen	17494	3965
23389	7590	07/16/2009	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC			WONG, LESLIE A	
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300			1794	
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/16/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/787,013	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LAURIDSEN, KIRSTEN
	<b>Examiner</b> Leslie Wong	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on April 27, 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 42-44, 46-54 and 56-63 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 42-44, 46-54 and 56-63 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 42-44, 46-54, and 56-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant does not clearly teach "in the absence of an intense sweetener." For example, the Specification (page 10, last paragraph) refers to both the presence and absence of intense sweeteners. Applicant's specification excludes an intense sweetener from being "a sweet tasting sugar compound" but does not exclude an intense sweetener from the product as a whole (see page 7, last paragraph).

Applicant's arguments filed April 27, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no need for an intense sweetener in the claimed invention.

Applicant states on page 7 of the response, "(a)lthough the specification does not explicitly state that the method lacks the use of an intense sweetener, this is the entire purpose of the present invention." The specification teaches (page 10, last paragraph)

that "the inventive synergistic sweetening effect is obtained with polydextrose independently of the presence or absence of intense sweeteners in the product." The specification teaches that the synergistic sweetening effect is obtained with polydextrose, it does not exclude intense sweeteners from the product.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42-44, 46-54, 56, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wong et al (EP 0447359), JP 7067536, and Yatka et al (US 5525360) for the reasons set forth in rejecting the claims in the last Office action.

Wong et al (EP 0447359) teach a synergistic sweetening composition comprising polydextrose, monosaccharides, and/or disaccharides as is claimed (see entire document, especially page 9, lines 38-51).

JP 7067536 teaches the combination of polydextrose and sugar (see abstract).

Yatka et al (US 5525360) teach a composition comprising polydextrose and additional sugar compounds including sucrose and maltose (see entire document, especially claims 7 and 9).

The claims appear to differ as to the specific recitation of pH and acidity.

The pH and acidity would be no more than inherent and/or obvious to that of Wong et al, JP 7067536, and Yatka et al as these values are inherent and/or obvious to a commercially available polydextrose product. It is noted that Applicant's polydextrose is a commercially available product.

Synergism would be obvious to that of Wong et al, JP 7067536, and Yatka et al as the same components are used. It is also noted that the concept of synergism in the sweetener art is well-known and expected. Schiffman et al (Chem Senses ) is cited as one example of synergism in the sweetener art (see entire document).

Claims 58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al (EP 0447359), JP 7067536, and Yatka et al (US 5525360) for the reasons set forth in rejecting the claims in the last office action.

Wong et al (EP 0447359), JP 7067536, and Yatka et al (US 5525360) are cited as above.

The claims differ as to the recitation of specific food products.

Once the art has recognized the use of a sweetener combination, its use and manipulation in different food products would be well-within the skill of the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the polydextrose/sugar compositions as taught by Wong et al (EP 0447359), JP 7067536, and Yatka et al (US 5525360) in different food products as once the art recognized the use of a sweetener combination, its use and manipulation in different food products would be conventional.

In the absence of a showing of unexpected results, Applicant is using known components to obtain no more than expected results.

Applicant's arguments filed April 27, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Wong et al is directed to the use of 1-chloro-1'-deoxysucrose and that Wong et al does not teach that polydextrose has any effect on the sweetness of sucrose.

Wong et al teach the combination of polydextrose and a mono- or disaccharide as is claimed (see entire document, especially page 9, lines 38-51).

Synergism would be inherent to that of Wong et al as the same components are used. It is further noted that the recitation "in the absence of an intense sweetener" does not clearly exclude additional components in the product.

Applicant does not address JP 7067536 and Yatka et al (US 5525360).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571)272-1411. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leslie Wong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

LAW  
July 15, 2009